

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c) and STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF
INTERVIEW

Application No.: 10/777,150

Attorney Docket No.: Q79322

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are all the claims pending in the application.

Statement of Substance of Interview

As an initial matter, Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview conducted on May 13, 2010. During the interview, the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) was discussed. Specifically, Applicants' representative explained the features of the present invention, discussed the differences between the claimed invention and the cited art of Oskouy and Kim and discussed claim amendments to further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art of Oskouy and Kim.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

Rejection of claims 1, 2 and 6-7 under § 103(a) over Oskouy in view of Kim

Claims 1, 2 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oskouy et al. (US Patent Publication No.: 2007/0147257), hereinafter "Oskouy", in view of Kim et al. (US Patent Publication No.: 2002/0078196).

Claim 1

Without conceding on the patentability of unamended claim 1, Applicant amends claim 1 to recite at least "an output unit for dividing the IP packet header and the IP packet trailer into second data in said units of transmission, receiving the IP packet header directly from the header processing unit, reading the IP packet trailer directly from the packet memory of the packet memory management unit based on the reported pointer of the IP packet trailer to be connected

to the IP packet header, and outputting the second data to a channel”. Applicant submits that the above noted claim feature is not disclosed or suggested by Oskouy and Kim, alone or in combination, for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner alleges that the combination of packeting queue 380 and cell segmentation engine 386 of Oskouy corresponds to the claimed packet memory management unit.

Additionally, the Examiner also alleges that the L2 pattern match decoder 382 and bank spray engine 392 of Oskouy corresponds to the claimed header processing unit and output unit.

Assuming *arguendo* that above correspondences are held true, Applicant submits that Oskouy fails to disclose or suggest at least “an output unit for...receiving the IP packet header directly from the header processing unit, reading the IP packet trailer directly from the packet memory of the packet memory management unit”. In other words, Oskouy fails to disclose or suggest the bank spray engine 392 for receiving the IP packet header directly from the L2 pattern match decoder 382 and reading the IP packet trailer directly from the combination of packeting queue 380 and cell segmentation engine 386.

Instead, bank spray engine 392 receives an input only from the cell segmentation engine 386 (see Fig. 3D of Oskouy). Therefore, even if assuming *arguendo* that the bank spray engine 386 receives both a header and a trailer, Applicant submits that Oskouy, at best, discloses receiving both the header and the trailer only from the cell segmentation engine 386 (which the Examiner alleges as corresponding to the claimed packet memory management unit). Kim does not make up for the above noted deficiencies of Oskouy.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c) and STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF
INTERVIEW

Application No.: 10/777,150

Attorney Docket No.: Q79322

For reasons similar to those submitted for claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 6 is also patentable.

Claims 2 and 7, which depend from claims 1 and 6, respectively, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

Allowable subject matter

Claims 3-5 and 8-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant requests the Examiner, however, to hold such rewriting of the claims in abeyance until the Examiner has had an opportunity to reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 1, 2 and 6-7.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c) and STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF
INTERVIEW

Application No.: 10/777,150

Attorney Docket No.: Q79322

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue
Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any
overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ S. Stuart Lee /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

S. Stuart Lee
Registration No. 61,124

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 1, 2010